## REMARKS

The September 9, 2004 Non-Final Office Action allowed claims 1-19 and 39-56, rejected claims 20-35 and 37-38, and objected to claim 36 pending in the application. This Response presents arguments in favor of allowing the rejected and objected claims.

### Claim Rejections –35 USC§102

Claims 20-23, 29 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ward et al. (EP 0880255). For the following reasons Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

### Ward et al.

In general, Ward aims to provide a virtual main office desktop environment to remote users. "With a single local *telephone call*" the user connects to the main office to obtain access to the services available through the telephone switching system at the main office, such as voice mail, directory access, incoming and outgoing calls, and. may include access to a web browser. ("Summary of Invention") The user's remote computing device connects through an IP network and a dedicated gateway to the telephone switching system. *A suitable client software installed on the computing device, usually a personal computer, is required.* (Column 4 lines 48-53).

In contrast to Ward, Applicant's claims 20 and 31 recite *a web server programmed to provide a dynamic GUI website.* Additionally, claim 20 recites the *remote device is configured to access the website and cause the remote access session* . Claims 20 and 31 further recite that *during the session, the remote device receives a textual display of the telephone-related event via the dynamic GUI website*, and *displays the dynamic GUI website*, respectively.

The Examiner points to reference numeral 70 on Ward's Figure 5 to support a web server having the same elements as recited in Applicant's claims. However, Figure 5 shows an implementation of the voice to IP gateway represented in Figure 4 and does not identify a web server. The gateway of Figure 5 consists of two parts, a PC DSP card 62 (hardware) and IP interface software 70. The software performs interfacing such that real time signals received from the DSP card are adapted to IP

Appl. No. 10/006,452                              Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2004
Resp. dated Dec. 3, 2004

standards before sending them to the IP network and conversely, signals received from the IP network are converted into real time signals and forwarded to the DSP card. (Column 9, lines 6-43). The IP gateway of Figure 5 *is not a web server and does not show or disclose a web server having the recited elements of Applicant's claims.* Moreover, Ward fails to teach, suggest or disclose *accessing a dynamic GUI website provided from a web server to cause the remote access session.* To the contrary, Ward discloses placing a single telephone call to access the main office switching system via the IP gateway.

Accordingly, Applicant suggests Ward fails to teach each and every element of Applicant's independent claims 20 and 31 and requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections. For among the same and additional reasons, Applicant requests the withdrawal of the Section 102 rejections to claims 21-23, 29 and 32-33, which depend from claims 20 and 31.

## Claim Rejections –35 USC§103

### Dunn et al.

Claims 24-28, 34-35 and 37-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward et al. (EP 0880255) in view in Dunn et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,651,054. For the following reasons Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Applicant discussed Dunn in a previous Response which resulted in withdrawn rejections and allowable claims. For ease of this discussion, the text from Applicant's prior Response is repeated below.

In general, Dunn discloses a method for monitoring live messages in a voice mail system as they are being recorded. In other words, the called party is able to monitor a message at the very time the message is being left by a caller. Upon system notification that a caller is leaving a voice mail message, the caller can "jump into" the message as it is being recorded and listen to the message in real time (however, in some cases there is up to a 5 second delay). If the caller wishes to interrupt the calling party and speak to them, the caller instructs the system to receive the call, otherwise the calling party completes the voice message. The voice sounds from the caller are converted from analog to digital and output by a voice board in packets of 1K, thereby

explaining the minimal delay to the called party while they wait for the first packet to be received.

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Ward with Dunn, and that Applicant's invention as claimed would result. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that even if the proposed combination of Ward with Dunn were made, Applicant's claimed invention would not be obtained. Specifically, the primary reference, Ward, either alone or in combination with Dunn, fails to teach, suggest or disclose a number of the elements recited in the claims. As previously pointed out, Ward does not disclose that *during a session, the remote device receives the textual display of a telephone-related event via a dynamic GUI website,* as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20. Additionally, Ward does not disclose *a web server having a dynamic GUI website stored thereon, and during the session, the portable device displays the dynamic GUI website,* as recited in Applicant's independent claim 31. Dunn does not teach, suggest or disclose a web server, utilizing a remote device or a dynamic GUI website; therefore, it cannot be suggested that the combination of Ward with Dunn can fill in the missing elements left by Ward.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections to claims 24-28, 34-35 and 37-38.

## Beerman Jr. et al.

Claim 30 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ward et al. In view of Beerman, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,084,952. For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Applicant discussed Berrman in a previous Response which resulted in allowable claims. For ease of this discussion, part of the text from Applicant's prior Response is repeated below.

In general, Beerman discloses acoustically coupling a remote device to a handset receiver of a telephone connected to the telephone network. Basically, the user places the speaker and microphone of the remote device in close proximity to a handset of telephone to facilitate the acoustical coupling. Acoustic tones are transmitted to a messaging server. Electronic messages include *non-real time stored*

*messages* such as facsimile messages and email messages. In fact, the Beerman system is impractical for real time live communication between the message server and the remote device because the data exchange between the remote device and messaging server is half-duplex, implying that either the remote device or the messaging server is transmitting on the connection at a given time, but never both at the same time, as in a live telephone call. (*See e.g.,* column 10, lines 52-53) After the session is terminated, i.e., all acoustical tones are transmitted, processing of the downloaded messages begins. This messaging processing is done *after the session is terminated* to reduce the amount of connection time between the remote device and the messaging server, which directly translates to reduced telecommunication costs for the user. (Column 12, lines 42-50).

The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Ward with Beerman, and that Applicant's invention as claimed would result. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant submits that even if the proposed combination of Ward with Beerman, were made, Applicant's claimed invention would not be obtained. Specifically, the primary reference, Ward, either alone or in combination with Beerman, fails to teach, suggest or disclose a number of the elements recited in the claims. As previously pointed out, Ward does not disclose that *during a session, the remote device receives the textual display of a telephone-related event via a dynamic GUI website*, as recited in Applicant's independent claim 20. Additionally, Beerman does not teach, suggest or disclose *a web server to provide a dynamic GUI website;* therefore, it cannot be suggested that the combination of Ward with Beerman can fill in the missing elements left by Ward.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Section 103 rejection to claim 30.

## Claim Objection

The Action indicates claim 36 includes allowable subject matter but is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim (claim 35 and 31). For the reasons stated above, Applicant submits claims 31 and 35 are patentably distinct over the

Appl. No. 10/006,452                                    Reply to Office Action of September 9, 2004
Resp. dated Dec. 3, 2004

references of record.  Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the objection to claim 36.

## Allowable Subject Matter

The Non-Final Office Action indicates claims 1-19 and 39-56 are allowed over the prior art of record.

## CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the above remarks, withdrawal of the Section 102 and 103 rejections, reconsideration of the objection to claim 30, and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance.  Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the above in greater detail or deem that amendments should be made to improve the application, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,
Inter-Tel, Inc.

Date: _December 3, 2004_          By: _Michelle R. Whittington_
                                      Michelle R. Whittington, Esq.
                                      Intellectual Property Counsel
                                      Reg. No. 43,844

**INTER-TEL, INC.**
7300 W. Boston St.
Chandler, AZ 85226
Direct:     (480) 961-9000 x21352
Facsimile:(480) 961-8073
Email: michelle_whittington@inter-tel.com

Page 6 of 6